

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/848,594	05/03/2001	Sujal Bhalakia	589.063US2	8703	
37374	7590 07/06/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
INSKEEP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP, INC 1225 W. 190TH STREET			ZACHARIA,	ZACHARIA, RAMSEY E	
SUITE 205	II STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
GARDENA, (	CA 90248		1773	-	

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The same of the sa	Application No.	Applicant(s)	1.
Advisory Action	09/848,594	BHALAKIA ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ramsey Zacharia	1773	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 16 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the contract of the con	ation. A proper reply to a	in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date	-		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officinely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection.  HE FINAL REJECTION. See I  R 1.136(a) and the appropriate  unt of the fee. The appropriate  originally set in the final Office	MPEP e extension te extension e action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2.⊠ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	,	<b>,</b>	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	•	rially reducing or simplify	ing the
(d) They present additional claims without cancelli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed ame	ndment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT pla	ce the
<ol> <li>The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.</li> </ol>	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were nev	vly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			n
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>50-58</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>59-79</u> .	,		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	•		
0. Other:			_
		Ramsey Zacharia Primary Examiner Tech Center 1700	

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No. 009/848,594

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed limitation that the laminate has cut edges and snugly conforms to a mold cavitycorresponding to a front surface of an injection molded eye lens is a new limitation that was not presented during prosecution and would require further search and consideration. As such, it does not materially reduce or simplify the issues for appeal.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: it is directed to proposed limitations presented in the amendment that was not entered.